

SB 210 in the 2025 legislative session on in-person voting seems to me to be a means of excluding legitimate voters who are less able to physically attend voting, like many of the aging state population (myself included), single parent homes, and the like, as well as to reduce voter turnout rates by encumbering voters via:

- 1) Needing to be aware of ALL impending elections, notably special elections, enough in advance to vote. The vote-by-mail method provides a nice reminder.
- 2) Extra time, effort, and financial cost spent to perform their civic duty. (Poll tax anyone?)
- 3) Especially for single parents, arranging for childcare to vote, unnecessary at present.
- 4) Fuel and/or transit cost to go to the polls.
- 5) Safety of going to a potentially unsafe place to vote, and risk of injury to frail voters.
- 6) According to the bill's text, low population counties require only one polling place per 20,000 population. Imagine having to stand in line behind even 1,000 people. Unlikely that many would be willing to spend time and effort to vote in the face of such. I recall skipping minor elections due to the length of the line when I was a young parent.
- 7) Finding such polling places.
- 8) For shift workers, it might not be possible to vote under the minimum open hour requirements of the bill. If polling is only open 8 hours, how would someone who works 10 hr. shifts, or longer, be able to comply, irrespective of travel and waiting time?
- 9) The lead time required for requesting a mail-in ballot may eliminate some from voting due to simply forgetting, procrastination, not being made aware of certain elections, etc.
- 10) Fundamentally, in-person voting seems like it would provide more opportunity for fraud by a much larger group of election workers who would have enough control over a large number of ballots to be easier prey for someone to induce them to influence elections for money, duress, political, and/or religious reasons.

In summary, it seems that the brunt of this measure is designed to shift both human and financial costs of voting toward the citizen, and does not consider risks to their safety, or the integrity of the ballot. Hence reducing the likelihood of performing their civic duty. Additionally, the actual cost to voters should be added to any change in state and county costs in the financial impact statement at a referendum.

If the legislature would like to tighten up the security of voting, perhaps making people provide additional proof of their identity when signatures are challenged would be more useful.

This just what I came up with between my now hourly bathroom breaks. I could go on if I thought about it more ...

Respectfully,

Tom August